



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/474,948 | 12/30/1999 | BRIAN PARSONNET | 25302 | 2982 |

7590 08/01/2006
HONETWELL INTERNATIONAL, INC
LEGAL DEPARTMENT DOCKETING CLERK
P.O. BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN,, NJ 07962

EXAMINER

JEANTY, ROMAIN

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3623

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/474,948 | Applicant(s) PARSONNET ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Romain Jeanty | Art Unit 3623 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-14, 19-24, 29 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 5-8, 15-18, 25-28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Final Office Action is in response to the communication received on April 14, 2006.
Claims 1-30 are pending in the application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment to claim has overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection. The rejection has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed September 15, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants asserted that Shkedy does not disclose the claimed invention. Applicants further supported their assertion by arguing that Shkedy does not disclose the concept of a customer (buyer) transferring messages through a main controller in response to a vendor inquiry. In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants' arguments because Shkedy clearly discloses the concept of exchanging messages between the buyer and the seller. Note col. 11, lines 21-31. In response to applicant's arguments (Pages 21-22) the references fails show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., ...asking one or more questions or **requesting additional documents**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicants' arguments that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner notes that McAtee clearly teaches the system of executing a workflow for clients "sellers and vendors". Combining

Applicants further argued (Page 25) that there is nothing in the Shkedy reference that suggests combining the teachings of the McAtee reference with the teachings of the Shkedy reference and there is nothing in the McAtee reference that suggests the teachings combining the teachings of the Shkedy reference. In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants' arguments because Shkedy discloses the concept of transmitting message to users of the system and McAtee teaches the system of executing a workflow in a business environment. Therefore, combining Shkedy and McAtee would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art with the motivation to control the flow of business.

Applicants further argued (Page 27) that there is no mention in either Shkedy or McAtee of a "plurality of workflow definitions defining at least one process step to be performed by at least one of said main controller. In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants' arguments because McAtee clearly teaches the concept of a workflow definitions. Note col. 3 line 62 through col. 4 line 3. Incorporating the workflow definition of McAtee into

Art Unit: 3623

Shkedy would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in order to control the workflow operations.

Applicants further argued that there is no mention in either Shkedy or McAtee of a primary workflow record associated with a service request and a secondary work flow record associated with a second request. In response, the examiner concedes that neither Shkedy or McAtee fails to teach applicants' claimed feature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 9-12, 19-22, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable by Shkedy (U.S. Patent No. 6,260,024) in view of McAtee (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,320).

As per claims 1, 9-12, 19-22, and 29-30, Shkedy discloses a systems and methods for providing a global bilateral buyer-driven system for creating binding contracts between sellers and buyers. In so doing, Shkedy discloses a main controller "i.e. a central controller for receiving a forward purchase order from and creating" capable of creating a first work flow record used to control a first work flow associated with a first service request and storing said

Art Unit: 3623

first work flow record in a storage device associated with said main controller main controller or (i.e., creating an actual order) (See figure 17, element S204 and col. 5, lines 41-48), generating a status record of the purchase order information in a remote server associated with the central controller (i.e., the order status module for generating order status record)(col. 5, lines 52-65); the central controller transmitting messages between the sellers and buyers regarding the status record of the purchase order (col. 17, lines 24-32); wherein said main controller is further capable of receiving from a first customer and a first vendor associated with said first work flow at least one of messages, storing said at least one of messages, in said storage device, and transferring at least one of said at least one of messages, to at least one of said first customer and said first vendor (i.e. a message database for storing messages received between a seller and a buyer) (col. 12, lines 29-55);

an account controller associated with said main controller capable of identifying at least one fee associated with said first work flow and storing fee data associated with said at least one fee in said first work flow record (i.e. charging a flat fee for the forward purchase order (col. 18, lines 23-48).

Shkedy does not explicitly disclose wherein said work flow is at least partially executed by said receiving, storing and transferring said at least one messages. McAtee in the same field of endeavor, discloses a computer system that can be configured to define, execute, monitor and control the flow of business operations. In so doing, McAtee discloses a workflow is at least partially executed by said receiving, storing and transferring said at least one messages (col. 3 line 62 through col. 4 lines 68). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosures of Shkedy to incorporate the

Art Unit: 3623

teachings of McAtee with the motivation to execute monitor and control the flow of business operations.

As per claim 2, Shkedy does not explicitly disclose wherein said first work flow record comprises a plurality of work flow definitions defining at least one process step to be performed by at least one of said main controller, said accounting controller, a first customer processing device associated with said first customer, and a first vendor processing device associated with said first vendor. McAtee in the same field of endeavor, discloses a computer system that can be configured to define, execute, monitor and control the flow of business operations comprising a database of workflow definitions (col. 6, lines 7-13). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Shkedy to include the teachings of McAtee. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a modification with the motivation to execute monitor and control the flow of business operations.

As per claim 12, Shkedy does not explicitly disclose wherein said first work flow record comprises a plurality of work flow definitions defining at least one process step to be performed by at least one of said main controller, said accounting controller, a first customer processing device associated with said first customer, and a first vendor processing device associated with said first vendor. McAtee in the same field of endeavor, discloses a computer system that can be configured to define, execute, monitor and control the flow of business operations comprising a database of workflow definitions (col. 6, lines 7-13). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Shkedy to include the teachings of McAtee. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been

Art Unit: 3623

motivated to use a modification with the motivation to execute monitor and control the flow of business operations.

7. Claims 3, 4, 13-14 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shkedy (U.S. Patent No. 5,9874,22) in view of McAtee (U. S. Patent No. 5,987,422) as applied to claims 1, 11 and 21 above and further in view of Flores (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,109).

As per claims 3-4, 13-14 and 23-24, the combination of Shkedy and McAtee et al does not explicitly disclose which party modifies the work orders or the work plan. However, a customer or vendor can modify work orders based on the price it will cost to repair a customer's equipment or the time it will take to fix or repair the equipment. Usually customers and vendor negotiate on prices. Therefore, allowing a customer or vendor to modify the work flow definitions would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in order to have a dynamic or a flexible system.

Furthermore, Flores et al discloses computerized method and system for managing business processes using linked workflow which modifies workflow definitions (col. 26, lines 62 through col. 27 line 55). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Shkedy and McAtee to include a workflow definitions modification as evidenced by Flores et al. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a modification because it would enable an application builder to create modify and delete definition documents in a database.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 5-8, 15-18, 25-28 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571) 272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30AM - 6:00PM.

Art Unit: 3623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R. Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 26, 2006


Romain Jeanty
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3623